

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

The Examiner required new corrected drawings because originally-filed FIGS. 17-33 are informal.

The Examiner objected to the specification because the Abstract includes the phrase "Apparatus is provided," which the Examiner states can be inferred.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by German patent application DE 198 06 556 A1 (hereinafter "DE '556"). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from DE '556 in view of Mitchell U.S. Patent No. 3,653,753 (hereinafter "Mitchell"). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from DE '556 in view of European patent application EP 0 393 243 A2 (hereinafter "EP '243").

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants furnish herewith twenty-five (25) sheets of formal drawings to replace the twenty-five sheets of drawings originally filed in this application. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended the Abstract to delete the phrase "is provided." No new matter has been added. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Applicants submit herewith a Rule 131 Declaration by applicant Joshua D. Spodek.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments, Rule 131 Declaration, and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Rejections Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-10 and 16-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by DE '556.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

DE '556 was cited because it purportedly discloses apparatus displaying multiple series of images to viewers in motion. DE '556 was published on August 26, 1999.

The enclosed Rule 131 Declaration sets forth that applicants' invention had been reduced to practice before August 26, 1999. In particular, the Exhibits accompanying the Declaration show that apparatus having an "A" series and a "B" series of images had been conceived of before August 26, 1999, that multiple image viewability, blurring, and magnification

issues had been identified before August 26, 1999, that a working model displaying images that appear animated to viewers in motion had been built before August 26, 1999*, and that the invention was ready for patenting before August 26, 1999.

Thus, because the enclosed Rule 131 Declaration demonstrates that applicants reduced to practice apparatus displaying multiple series of images to viewers in motion prior to the publication date of DE '556, that reference is no longer available as prior art.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-10 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

The Rejections Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of DE '556 and Mitchell, and claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of DE '556 and EP '243.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

* See, in particular, notebook page 116, lines 1-2: "Huge success! I built some small models to see if they would work at walking speed and they do!" Also see notebook page 118, about line 9: "The animation clearly works" and notebook page 119, line 9: "The device worked successfully."

Application No. 09/689,239
November 21, 2003 Reply To
Office Action


As explained above, DE '556 is not available as prior art. Moreover, neither Mitchell nor EP '243, alone or in combination, shows the features of applicants' invention for which DE '556 was cited. Thus, claims 11-15 are not obvious from either Mitchell or EP '243, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-25 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Garry J. Tuma
Registration No. 40,210
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000